INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Prosecution's Witnesses	Direct	Cross
Ching Teh-chun		2360 to 2418

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

Pros.	Def.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
	202	Scroll presented to DOHIHARA	2374	
	203	Book in Japanese and Chinese entitled "Down with Japan" "Why China Expels Japan Edited by TAKASHI, Hohu	2389	

1	Tuesday, 23 July, 1946
2	
3	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL
4	FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building
5	Tokyo, Japan
6	
7	The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment,
8	at 0930.
9	
10	
11	Appearances:
12	For the Tribunal, same as before.
13	For the Prosecution Section, same as before.
14	For the Defense Section, same as before.
15	
16	
17	(English to Japanese, Japanese to
18	English, English to Chinese, Chinese to
19	English interpretation was made by the
20	Language Section, IMTFE.)
21	
22	
2.5	
24	
25	

Whalen & Duda

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except OKAWA and HIRANUMA, who are represented by counsel.

At the desire of the representative of the Netherlands, I wish to point out that the statement in the Nippon Times that he was affected by the heat is not correct.

I gave no interview to any pressmen. I told Captain Stickle, who is an officer in the army and attached, I understand, to General MacArthur's Headquarters, that Members representing countries with a cold climate were suffering severely from the heat. I did not mention names, nor did I mention countries. If I decided to mention names, I think that the representative of the Netherlands would not have been named. He has a power of endurance second only to that of the Supreme Commander. The Supreme Commander, of course, has had the advantage of being through a hundred battles in those green hills between Morotai, Port Moresby and Manila. And he has come through with unimpaired health and, as far as I can judge, without having added a day to his years. None of us desires to be compared with him.

20 21

22

23 24

Does any counsel desire to mention any matter? 1 COLONEL MORROW: No, sir. THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Morrow. 3 COLONEL MORROW. I understand the defense 4 will continue with cross-examination, if the Court please. 6 MR. OHTA: I am counsel OHTA, Kinjiro, 7 representing the defendant DOHIHARA. I wish to be 8 permitted to continue the cross-examination begun 0 10 yesterday. CHING 11 TEH - CHUN, called as a witness 12 on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the 13 stand and testified as follows: 14 CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) 15 BY MR. OHTA: 16 Mr. Witness, is it not true that in connection 17 with the Hopei-Chahar Political Council and the 18 Autonomy Movement in North China, the Mayor of 19 Tientsin, Hsiao-Chenying, and the President of the 20 Peining Railway, Chen-Chuehsheng, agreed to and sup-21 ported the movement which I have just mentioned? 22 In regard to the establishment of Hcpei-23 Chahar Political Council, Hsiao-Chenying and Chen-24 Chuehsheng had kept contact with DOHIHARA and had 25 discussions with him. In regard to the matters of

3

4

5

7

0

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

autonomy, the Japanese Government had put up this proposition and relayed these propositions to the Ckinese Government through Chen-Chuehsheng. Did not General Sung-Cheyuan, Commander-in-Chief of the Peiping Defense Corps, also approve of this program? THE MONITOR: Correction: Peiping-Tientsin area. General Sung-Cheyuan agreed to the establishment of Hopei-Chahar Political Council with the view to maintain peace and order in and around the area of Peiping-Tientsin. But he has never agreed to the Autonomous Movement in as far as that area is concerned. However, is it not true that General Sung-Cheyuan, on the 17th of November, established the Council for the People's Guidance, and through this organ resoliated with the central government on this matter? A Fuch Cuidance Council as you said was never in existence. Are you aware of the fact that General Sung-Cheyuan very greatly welcomed the establishment of

the Hopei-Chahar Folitical Council and that he had

given voice to the principle of respecting the will

of the people and the maintenance of harmony between

Japan and China?

A Probably there was.

Q However, at this time are you not aware of

Q However, at this time are you not aware of the fact that not only General Sung-Cheyuan but all who participated in this program welcomed the project and expressed their gratitude to General DOHIHARA for the efforts he had made, and that General Sung, through Chen-Chuehsheng, expressed the desire that General DOHIHARA remain in that area in order to carry on liaison work between the Kwantung Army and the Tientsin Army?

A That I don't know. What I know is that at that time all of us were feeling the oppression of DOHIHARA, and to that oppression we felt very badly.

Q Then I wish to present to the witness a scroll which was sent by General Sung-Cheyuan to General DOHIHARA as a token of his gratitude. I wish to have the witness look at this scroll.

CLERK OF THE COURT: This scroll will be marked defense exhibit No. 202.

THE PRESIDENT: It was not tendered. I do not know whether he wants it tendered or not. Do not mark it yet.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Mark it for identification.

THE PRESIDENT: If he tenders that document, or whatever it is, it may have a serious effect on the course of the trial. I will see that he understands his position before it is offered.

MR. OHTA: Then, Mr. President, I should like to consider the presentation of this scroll as evidence at a later stage. But may I be permitted to show this scroll to the witness for identification?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

THE PRESIDENT: In the Charter it will appear that the prosecution has the last word, in any event. At least that construction is open.

25

THE PRESIDENT: If he tenders that document, . 1 or whatever it is, it may have a serious effect on the 2 course of the trial. I will see that he understands 3 his position before it is offered. MR. OHTA: Then, Mr. President, I should like 5 to consider the presentation of this scroll as evidence 6 at a later stage. But may I be permitted to show this 7 scroll to the witness for identification? 9 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. (Whereupon, a document was handed to 10 the witness.) 11 THE PRESIDENT: In the Charter it will 12 13 appear that the prosecution has the last word, in any 14 event. At least that construction is open. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

Greenberg & Batton

A This is the first time I have seen this scroll. This scroll was presented by General Sung Che-yuan to DOHIHARA, at the time he left China, as a souvenir. This presentation is rather common between the officials of the countries.

At that time General Sung Che-yuan was taking charge of affairs in that area. He not only presented scrolls or gifts of like nature to Japanese officials, but also he presented to other military attaches or other foreign officials having official functions in that area.

Q Next, Mr. Witness, I should like to inquire with respect to a statement by you in your affidavit with respect to the July 7 Incident. You speak of TANAKA's Second Plan of World Absorption, et cetera, on the fourth page of the affidavit. I should not consider this to be a fact. Is it not a mistake on your part?

A This statement of mine was based on the pamphlet which was then circulated throughout China. In that pamphlet it was stated that TANAKA had the plan to dominate the whole world.

That plan involves four stages: The first stage was that the Japanese would dominate and occupy Manchuria and Mongolia; the second stage was that of

S

domination over North China; the third and fourth stages were evidences by the fact, in 1940, when the Japanese started the Pearl Harbor adventure.

Q Who was the author of this pamphlet?

A That was printed in China, was known as the "TANAKA Memorandum."

you say that Japanese troops maneuvered on Chinese territory at their own will. However, are you not aware of the fact that following the Boxer Uprising in the year 1900 a protocol known as the "Boxer Protocol" was concluded between China and other Allied countries and that the Japanese Army maneuvered on Chinese soil on the basis of treaty stipulations as provided for in the Boxer Protocol?

A Yes, I know. But, according to the practice then, it was that before any maneuver was taking place, a notice must be sent to the local government through which the inhabitants of that particular locality would be informed.

THE MONITOR: I would like to make a correction for English interpretation of defense counsel's
question: "Not only our country, but other signatories to this protocol had the same right to maneuver on Chinese soil."

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Are you also not aware of the fact that these proper steps were taken before these maneuvers were held?

A Many protests were made by the Chinese authorities to the Japanese military authorities on the ground that many of the maneuvers were not previously informed, and the inhabitants of the various localities were very much frightened. The maneuvers taking place at the time of the outbreak of Marco Polo Bridge Incident was never informed previously to the Chinese authorities.

Q Maneuvers were held in that area after permission had been secured from General Sung Che-yuan in accordance with the treaty stipulations in the Boxer Protocol; but were not even greater permission secured before these maneuvers were held?

Addition: Did not the Japanese Army authorities secure from General Sung Che-yuan permission even greater than that permitted by the Boxer Protocol?

A In the first point, as far as that Boxer Protocol is concerned, the foreign countries may put up maneuvers along the railway line, but they are not authorized to have -- to take any maneuvers in any further off places.

Q Shortly after the outbreak of the Lukuochiao Incident on 29 July, 1937, an incident called the Tung-Chow Incident occurred. Are you familiar with or aware of this Incident?

A I only heard of that after the Incident took place. At that time I was already not in Peiping.

Q The Tung-Chow Incident was started by Chi-

nese instigators and was started against the East
Hopei Anti-Communist regime by a part of the Pao-antsui or the Peace Preservation Corps in Tung-Chow.

As a result of this attack, many of Japanese nationals resident there, including many women and children,
were massacred. Even after this Incident, you must
have received reports to the effect, is that not so?

A I only heard of this matter. At that time I -- General Sung Che-yuan and I both were in Pao-Ting.

Q Then, are you also not aware of the fact that Japanese troops in Peiping were fired on by Chinese troops on 26 July of the same year?

A The fighting started from July 8 when the hostilities at the Marco Polo Bridge broke out and that hostilities was never ended until somewhere in 1945.

1	Q In your affidavit you state that General
2	DOHIHARA was responsible for the outbreak of the
3	Incident of September 18, 1931. On what grounds do
4	you make this charge against him?
5	A That statement was based on intelligence
6	reports and documents received by the Chinese
7	authorities.
8	Q Are you not aware of the fact that about the
9	time of the September 18 Incident DOHIHARA had gone
10	to Tokyo to report on the NAKAMURA, Shintaro Incident
11	and that when the Incident broke out on September 18
12	he was en route back to Mukden after having made the
13	report and was very much astonished when he heard of
14	it, which was after the Incident broke out?
15	A That I don't know.
16	MR. OHTA: That concludes my cross-examin-
17	ation.
18	THE PRESIDENT: The scroll shown the witness
19	should be marked for identification.
20	Call out the number.
21	CLERK OF THE COURT: It is marked 202 for
22	identification.
23	(Whereupon, the document above
24	referred to was marked defense ex-
25	hibit No 202 for identification)

hibit No. 202 for identification.)

Wolf & Spratt

MR. ITO: I am counsel ITO, Kiyoshi, counsel for the defendant, MATSUI, Iwane.

Since the witness does not speak the official language of this Tribunal, and, naturally, it would increase the difficulties were he to speak in another language, I shall ask questions which it would be sufficient for the witness to reply with yes or 20:

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. ITO:

Q I should like to have the witness be careful not to stray outside of the point asked in my questions and that he stick to the point.

THE PRESIDENT: These admonitions are not called for. Please ask questions straight away.

THE CHINESE MONITOR: As the Chinese Monitor,
I wish to state that there has been a mistake in translation, and that the original in Chinese reads, "the
Japanese military clique," rather than, as the interrogator just said, "the Japanese aggressor."

Q In your affidavit, Mr. Witness, you mentioned a Japanese officer by the name of MATSUI in two places. At one point you speak of a MATSUI, Chief of the Special Service Section, who was in Peiping at the outbreak of the Marco Polo Incident on July 7, 1937. In another place you speak of a retired Japanese army

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

20

21

25

officer by the name of MATSUI having come to Peiping
in the fall of 1935. May I ask whether these two
MATSUIS are one and the same person or different persons?

A They are two different persons.

Q When this retired General MATSUI visited North China in 1935, he saw you, Mr. Witness, and he said that, in quoting the words of SUN Yat-Sen, if Japan and China would come together and join hands it would mean the salvation of Asia. That was the meaning of the Greater Asia Doctrine; is that not so?

A I don't recall that.

Q If you do not recall this fact, I shall refer to the Greater East Asia Annual, and, sir, will you try to recall this fact?

THE PRESIDENT: Continue with your question.

Q Do you not recall that on the 1st of December the leaders of North China gathered together at the Hsi-hu Hotel in Tientsin and created a Founders Committee for the China Greater Asia Association?

A I never participated in that meeting.

Q However, this record shows that General SUNG 23 Che-yuan HAN-Fuchii, and yourself, CHING Teh-chun, and 24 others, had participated in this gathering.

A As I said, I never participated in the meeting

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

24

25

of the so-called Friends of the Greater Asia Society in China. Whether somebody used my name or not, that I cannot tell. I heard that one man, CHI Hsieh-yuan, 3 who is now being committed as a traitor in China, participated in that meeting.

Was there any other person in North China by the name of CHING Teh-chun?

No. Was it CHENG Chueh-sheng who used my name to be put up in that record?

In your affidavit you state that the Greater East Asia -- the Greater Asia Doctrine -- would be perfectly satisfactory if it were based on the spirit of reciprocity. However, Doctor SUN Yat-Sen's Greater Asia Doctrine -- with reference to Doctor SUN Yat-Sen's Greater Asia Doctrine, I should not think that leaders in North China would not approve of it; and so I am inclined to think that you were among those who approved it. Will you try to recall your position on that matter?

When MATSUI was talking on the subject of establishing the French Office of Greater Asia Society, General SUNG and I both expressed disapproval of the project; but this project was approved by SUNC Che-yuan and CHI Hsieh yuan, as I told you. As I have said, the meeting was held in Tientsin, and that HUNG Fu-chu and

SUNG Che-yuan were both present at the meeting. But, as a matter of fact, HUNG Fu-chu was always stationed in Chen-tung, but he sometimes came to Tientsin. So I even doubt if that is true.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1046, a recess was taken until 1102, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Goldberg & Duda.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The Tribunal is now resumed.

BY MR. ITO (Continuing):

Q Mr. Witness, I must say that you have said that many leaders in North China were unable to attend, even by airplane, the founders' meeting of the Greater Asia Society in Tientsin. But what I said is not that all or the many Chinese leaders in North China attended this founders' meeting, but what I did say was that a founders' meeting was held in Tientsin and that after that, many of the leaders in North China approved of this organization.

A As I said, I have never participated in that meeting. If I had ever been to that meeting, I would have signed the attendance book and if I had signed the attendance book, naturally I would recognize my own writing. If I had never attended and never signed the attendance book, then it is possible that somebody else just put my name on.

Q I did not say that you, Mr. Witness, attended
this meeting in Tientsin. In your statement, Mr. Witness, you said, you speak of the Chinese Greater East
Asia Association as being a branch of an organization
with headquarters in Japan. But the record upon which
I speak does not mention a branch but an entirely

independent Chinese organization founded upon the 1 Greater East Asia doctrine. The resolution of the 2 meeting of which I speak states that it has been a 3 mistake for the peoples of Asia to quarrel among 4 themselves and that, instead, the peoples of Asia, 5 in the spirit of the fact that Asia is an area for the 6 peoples of Asia, should resolve their quarrels and 7 become friends and that China and Japan, most of all, 8 should come together, collaborate as friends, and lay 9 10 the basis for the emancipation of Asia. And this declaration further goes on to state that since a 11 12 Greater Asia Association has been established in 13 Japan, a similar organization independent unto itself 14 should also be created in China in parallel with the 15 organization in Japan. Do vou not recall this? 16 I am afraid that the defense lawyer had 17 mixed up the purpose of the so-called "Great Asia 18 Society" with the organization, with the actual 19 doings of that society. The reason that I abstained 20 from participating in this meeting is that --21 If you have not approved of it, that is 22 enough from you. 23 A No, I must give it further treatment. 24 I should like to ask questions on questions of 25 greater import. That is not necessary. In your

affidavit you speak of an agreement between you and

DOHIHARA; and in that agreement it is stated that the

activities of the Kuomintang should be removed from

the Chahar District. What do you mean by that?

A There was no stipulation to the effect that the Chinese troops should be withdrawn from Chahar but there was a stipulation that the troops stationed in the Sixth District North of Kalgan should be withdrawn and in its place the police guards should be sent forward.

Q You speak of the fact that in Chahar Province there was an anti-Japanese organ, there were measures for the control and enforcement of measures against the anti-Japanese organs as well as anti-Japanese activities in Chahar Province. Now what kind of organizations did exist in that area, what kind of anti-Japanese organizations existed in that area, may I ask?

A There was never any anti-Japanese associations or organizations in Chahar. The policy of the Central Government then was that unless there is no hope of peace, they will not give up the negotiations of peace and if there is no -- unless there is no hope of peace, they will not give up the hope of peace.

Local government then, in conformity with the

policy of the Central Government, tried their best to carry out this policy and there was not at all any anti-Japanese movement.

The Japanese militarists, with a view to push forward their aggressive plan and with the ultimate end of effecting autonomous movement ip North China, they simply branded the headquarters, the Kuomintang Headquarters in the Chapei Province (northern part of Chahar Province) and other political organs as anti-Japanese organizations.

Q I should like to have you reply to my question.

A There was no anti-Japanese movement in China, I said that.

Q In other words, Mr. Witness, you mean to say there was no anti-Japanese organizations in Chahar at that time?

A The fact that there were many Japanese goods flooding the markets in Kalgan and north of Kalgan is a very good proof that there was no anti-Japanese sentiment existing then in that area. The Japanese just wanted to get rid of Chinese political organizations and other official organizations, got rid of them in those areas and branded these political official organizations as anti-Japanese organizations.

COL. MORROW: If the Court please, I ask that counsel be warned to allow the witness to finish his answer. There are several instances here where the witness here has been prevented from finishing his answer.

THE PRESIDENT: The red lights are not being

THE PRESIDENT: The red lights are not being effectively used and there should be a military policeman along at the lectern with counsel.

A 1 Q Then, Mr. Witness, you say in your statement that it was necessary to enforce measures
a 2 against anti-Japanese organizations in Chahar. From
this fact I must assume that there was an anti-Japment that it was necessary to enforce measures
against anti-Japanese organizations in Chahar. From
this fact I must assume that there was an anti-Japment that it was necessary to enforce measures
against anti-Japanese organizations in Chahar. From
this fact I must assume that there was an anti-Japment that it was necessary to enforce measures
against anti-Japanese organizations in Chahar. From
this fact I must assume that there was an anti-Japment that it was necessary to enforce measures
against anti-Japanese organizations in Chahar. From

A That expression is an expression loaned from the demands made by the Japanese. At that time the Japanese took the party quarters in the local areas, the editorials published by papers against the Japanese theory of putting North China as an autonomous government, and students parades as gestures of anti-Japanese movements. The local government then, pursuant to an order received from the central government, which for the purpose of securing peace had ordered that all the party quarters in the various districts and some political organs were removed from these districts and the students and other people were admonished by the authorities not to hold any more parades.

Q What do you mean by youth demonstrations?

A There was never any students parades held in Chahar, but in Peiping there was a few parades held. The students held the parades simply because they felt that the Japanese aggression was endless; that the Japanese is pushing forward even

as far as Peiping then. At that time I, as mayor of Peiping, advised the students to go back to their schools and told them that if in the event of Japanese closing in on Peiping, we would get together and try to ward off this danger. Ever since that time I received the students en masse and gave them that piece of advice the students went back to their schools and they have never held any parades any more.

Q The anti-Japanese movement carried on by the Japanese youth, if you search into the causes of this movement, is it not correct to say that anti-foreign education, especially anti-Japanese education, was carried on in China long before the Manchurian Incident?

A This is nothing but a patriotic movement from the students. The students being oppressed by the Japanese aggression expressed themselves in such an act. This patriotic movement was seen only after September 18. Before that we had one movement also held by the students, called the "Five-Four Movement." That movement was only for cultural purposes.

Q I have here, Mr. Witness, a book, and it states that China after the opium war will fall victim to the aggression of Britain, France, Germany, Japan, and America, and that China must expel those

foreign powers and that this type of doctrine was written into the text books used in the schools of China in their geography books, in their history books, and in their language books, of which there are more than five hundred different kinds. Are you or are you not aware of this fact?

A That I do not know.

MR. ITO: That concludes my cross-examination.

MR. ITO: That concludes my cross-examination, sir.

COLONEL MORROW: I would like to know the name of that book, if the Court please.

MR. WARREN: We have a copy. You can see it later.

I am Colonel Warren.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. WARREN:

Q In your statement which you adopted before this Tribunal as your evidence in chief you remarked under Prologue A=1, the political situation and you set out various members of the Chinese Government as holding various positions. Will you tell the Tribunal whether all of those men were appointed by the Central Government of China or the Nanking Government?

A They were all appointed by the Central Government.

Q Were they all members of the same political 1 party? 2 They were all members of the Kuomingtang. A 3 As a matter of fact, the Kuomingtang, or the 4 political party to which you refer, was the National 5 Government at Nanking, is not that correct? 6 7 A Yes. 8 At that time how far did the control of the 9 various provinces of China -- strike that. I will 10 put it this way: how far did the governmental con-11 trol of this political party extend in China at the 12 time of the so-called Incident at the Marco Polo 13 Bridge? 14 With the exception of the northeastern 15 three provinces, the Province of Jehol and the 16 twenty-two districts east of Hopei Province, the 17 Province of Hopei, Shangteng, Shangshi, Chahar, were 18 all under the power and control of the Kuomingtang. 19 The provinces which you excepted then were 20 the provinces which were in controversy between the 21 Nanking Government and the Japanese Government. Is 22 that not correct? 23 Yes, they were. 24 Now, were not the provinces which you named

under the control of the Nanking Government actually

2

3

4

5

6

under the control of the army, which belonged to the political party that you were a member of?

> Yes. A

Is it not true that the Nanking Government had aggressive ideas of its own which were well known to Japan?

A I do not understand what you mean. Nanking Government has never harbored any aggressive plans or ideas.

Do you mean to tell this Tribunal that the Q political party of which you are a member, which is, and was at that time the Central Government of China, never had any idea of expanding its sphere of influence by war or otherwise?

A No.

Now, in the following paragraph, or the second paragraph rather, under sub-paragraph A-1, you state that: "Since their costless invasion of the Chinese North-Eastern three Provinces, followed by the invasion of the Jehol Province, and the Battle of the Great Wall, the Japanese aggressors considered all these Provinces in North China as something that could be very easily taken over." Now, I should like to know where you got the authority for that statement. And, General, sir, I want facts, if you

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

have them; if you have no facts to back up that statement, will you so state? INTERPRETER: Where is the Chinese copy?

MR. WARREN: I don't have the Chinese copy of this. Can you read the English and interpret it into Chinese? It is document 1750.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think this is a convenient time to recess, but before we do I would like the counsel for -- is it MATSUI, Iwane, to tender the book from which he read to the witness, to tender it for identification. What is the number?

CLERK OF THE COURT: Marked for identification No. 203.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 203 for identification.)

MR. WARREN: May we note our exception to the order of the Tribunal? Reference merely was made to it, and asked if he had knowledge of it, and if we decide to use this at a later time, which we probably will, it is forcing us to present our defense before we have had an opportunity to examine the evidence or to move for a finding of not guilty. THE PRESIDENT: Counsel is not satisfied

24

- 1	
1	merely to ask the witness whether he knew of the
2	book, but he went further and read from it. Under
3	those circumstances it should be in the custody of
4	the Court. We will recess now until one thirty.
5	MR. WARREN: If your Honor please, I had
6	forgotten that I did quote from the book, and I was
7	wrong and may I withdraw my objection? I am sorry,
8	sir.
9	(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was
10	taken.)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

AFTERNOON SESSION D u MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International 2 d a Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. 3 å Mr. President, we have a Chinese-English W interpreter who is now ready to be sworn. 5 h a THE PRESIDENT: Let him be sworn. e 7 (Whereupon, Major M. N. Chien was sworn as Chinese to English and English to 8 9 Chinese interpreter.) 10 CHING T E H - C H U N, called as a witness 11 on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the 12 stand and testified as follows: 13 14 THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren. MR. WARREN: Would the translation section read 15 16 back the question in English-Japanese and again to the witness in Chinese. 17 18 ACTING LANGUAGE SECTION CHIEF: The reporter 19 has changed shifts and is not here to read it back to 20 you. 21 MR. WARREN: I do not exactly remember the 22 question. THE PRESIDENT: You had better repeat it. BY MR. WARREN (Continuing): 24

In your affidavit, second paragraph of

subparagraph 1A, you say that "since their costless invasion of the Chinese North-Eastern three Provinces, followed by the invasion of the Jehol Province, and the Battle of the Great Wall, the Japanese aggressors considered all these Provinces in North China as something that could be very easily taken over." Now, for the basis of -- we should like, rather, your authority for the basis of that statement and we desire facts, if you have facts, and if you do not have them we desire that you so state.

Manchuria in their possession, and in 1933 the Jehol Incident, in the same year the Japanese Army marched in the Great Wall line, that is, the Ku-peikow Gate-the Leng-kou, the Hsi-honkou, Ku-peikow. The above-mentioned gates along the Great Wall were all strategic points, and south of that Great Wall the terrain lies flat and is a plain and is very hard to defense. That is why we can draw the conclusion since the Japanese Army are marching from the north to the south and past our strategic points of defense, and evidently their aim is to take the North China into their posses-sten, too.

Q General, sir, I asked you if you had facts, not conclusions. Do you have any facts other than any

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

conclusions that you drew?

A Since May of 1933 the Japanese forces had reached Tupg-chou which is only forty mile from Peiping, the political center of North China, and along that line from Tung-chou to Tientsin. That is a very evident fact, that Japan was going to take over Peiping and Tientsin. By this fact there comes the May 31 Tang-ku Agreement. By this Tang-ku Agreement we were forced into, Chinese troops had to withdraw from the line mentioned above; that is, from Tung-chou to Tientsin -- had to withdraw all east from that line.

Q Just a minute. You are obviously not answering the question or you misunderstand what I mean. Now, how many Japanese troops, if you know, were in the Northern Provinces, in northern China, in July, 1937?

THE INTERPRETER: Is this question as a series.

THE INTERPRETER: Is this question a continuation of your last question?

MR. WARREN: This question is not.

THE INTERPRETER: General Ching hasn't finished up his last answer yet.

MR. WARREN: I stated that I did not desire him to finish. He did not answer my question. I am proceeding.

A According to our knowledge, at the time when the Marco Polo Bridge Incident broke out, the Japanese

had a division in Peiping and Tientsin. That is about 15,000 men. Then you do not know, and did not know at that time, how many troops were there, did you? THE INTERPRETER: We just say that 15,000 men in Peiping and Tientsin--MR. WARREN: Before you interpret that, I have 7 not asked this witness a question. He answered my other and entirely to my satisfaction. 9 We don't know the exact number. 10 MR. WARREN: Just a moment, please. I stated 11 that I want to ask another question. He answered my question. I do not care for the voluntary statements 13 of this witness. I want to proceed with my cross-14 15 examination. COLONEL MORROW: I take it, if the Court please, 16 that a witness can always make an answer and explain 17 18 and expand. 19 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, undoubtedly. 20 MR. WARREN: Yes, your Honor. How is he going 21 to explain or expand on the statement that there were 15,000 there according to their belief? That is all I asked him. 24 THE PRESIDENT: Well, we will hear his amplification.

MR. WARREN: Very well. I object to it, sir.

A (Continuing) We don't know the exact number. All over the North China, Japanese troops. But we know definitely that there is a garrison command in Tientsin, and a brigade in Peiping, totaling about a division, which has the strength of 15,000, and there are some more over other parts of China which we don't know the exact number.

Q Now, you state definitely that you know there were 15,000 at least. Will you go ahead and state whether or not those troops were in there illegally?

A According to the agreement drawn after the Opium War, Japanese, or Japan, was authorized to station troops only along the railway from Peiping to Ching-huang-tao to guard the safety of that railroad. Any amount excessive than the necessity is illegal.

Q In order that the witness will not later be confused, I am referring apecifically to a time in early July preceding July 7, which is on the date that the so-called Marco Polo Bridge Incident occurred. I ask him if he refers to the same period of time.

A What we have said is referred to the same time as what you asked; and after July 7, 1937, after the incident started, Japan massed more troops from Man-churia to North China.

Greenberg & Harton

Q On page 4 of the American version of document 1750, which is prosecution's exhibit 198, you refer to the incident when a soldier of a Japanese Army was alleged to have been lost on maneuvers and a search was demanded in Chinese territory by the Japanese. And, after having had that intelligence conveyed to you, you stated, "I immediately" -- I am reading now -- "replied that Japanese troops, maneuvering in Chinese territory at their own will, were in violation of international law."

Do you still maintain that they were in violation of international law?

A We have answered this question to you this morning.

Q Ask him to answer the question.

A According to the agreement drawn in 1900, after the Opium War, though it authorized the Japanese to station troops along the railroad in North China, and the necessary maneuver along the railroad -- but in case of that maneuver, has to be -- the Chinese Government has to be notified in advance so that all the residents along the railroad would be in turn notified, and to prevent any misunderstanding.

First, we have to make a correction here:

The agreement drawn in 1900 was after the Boxer -so-called Boxer trouble which is now the Opium War.

And also the place where the Japanese troops was
authorized to carry out maneuver can be too far from
where they were stationed. They cannot be stationed
at Fengtai and maneuver near Nanking.

Q I will read to you from prosecution's exhibit 58 which has heretofore been introduced in evidence, and it refers to a report adopted by the League of Nations Assembly on October 6, 1937. It is on page 384 as mine is marked.

about 7,000 Japanese soldiers in Northern China.

These troops were kept there on the basis of the Protocol of September 7th, 1901 (and its annexes), concluded between China and the Powers having legations at Peking. Under these Agreements, China recognized the right of each Power to maintain a permanent guard in the legations quarter at Peking and to occupy twelve specified points for the maintenance of open communication between the capital and the sea. Under the terms of a supplementary Agreement of July 15th-18, 1902, the foreign troops stationed at these points had 'the right of carrying on field exercises and rifle practice, etc., without

25

informing the Chinese authorities, except in the case 1 of feux de guerre'." 2 (Whereupon, the witness began to 3 speak in Chinese.) (Continuing) I haven't asked any question 5 yet. 6 Now, after having had this read to you, do 7 you agree with that statement or do you disagree? 8 We still hold that the statement is true be-9 cause we had an agreement with the Japanese garrison 10 commander that they should notify us in advance of 11 12 any of their field exercises. Now, that's the point that I want to get to, 13 General, sir. Regardless of the international commit-14 ments of your nation, you felt, or your garrisons and 15 your various generals felt that they could make agree-16 17 ments without the approval of their government; is 18 that correct? 19 It is not a remedy to the agreement; but, 20 since the Japanese troops were carrying out maneuvers 21 and field exercises so frequently, not like other 22 foreign troops in that authorized area, we had to 23 have some kind of agreement with them to prevent 24 violence and misunderstanding to happen.

Beside me there would be another witness who

was a District Minister of Wan-Ping Hsien where the incident started. He can tell you that he had an agreement with the Japanese battalion commander stationed at Fengtai whose name is ICHINOKI, Kiyonao.

Q General, sir, I am not interested in the agreement that you say you had there. I'm interested in the statement you made to this Court as a factual account that you told your subordinates that the Japanese were acting in violation of international law.

The question is, why did you inform your subordinate officers that Japan acted in violation of international law when she did not act in violation of international law?

A The reason why I told my subordinates

Japanese were violating the international law were
because they didn't hold their promise. Maybe I

didn't have sufficient reference at hand in that
time in this literary term "international law."

Q General, sir, what made you believe that an oral agreement between two battalion commanders, or whatever their regimental rank was if they had any -- a sort of a gentlemen's agreement -- could anywhere broach international law and international agreements between two nations?

A A gentlemen's agreement between the chief of local government and the Japanese garrison commander was to maintain the peace and order of that area. It is not in contrary with the spirit of international law.

Why I said that this gentlemen's agreement is not in contrary to international law, because the Japanese troops were carrying out intensive field maneuvers and with actual firing. If they don't give us notice in advance, it would incur injury of the Chinese civilians and residents in that area and will cause violence and disorder which is in contrary of the spirit of international law or the agreement drawn in 1900 to maintain the poace and order along the railroad, to maintain the communication to the sea. If they didn't give us notice in advance, and carrying out their maneuver with actual light ammunition, it would result in disorder and violence.

Q Now, General, what were the Chinese troops doing all this time? What were they doing?

A At the moment when the incident was reported to me, I immediately called up the regimental
commander of my troops stationed at Marco Polo Bridge
and Wan-Ping Hsien and checked that our troops have
all retired -- were all sleeping at that time.

Wolf & Spratt

Q General, you stated a few moments ago that Japan had more troops than any other nation in China at the time in accordance with the Protocol of September 7, 1901. Now, is it not true that Japan also suffered many more losses of life of her nationals and of destruction of property by undisciplined members of the armed forces of China, and by banditry than any other nation in China at that time?

A Since the 1901 agreement was drawn, there was not disorder in North China which caused any Japanese suffering of lives. It is because that Japan was preparing for an invasion and aggression, and using this reason like you stated to mass troops in North China. In fact, at a time around July 7, 1937, the order in North China, especially around Peiping, was well maintained. This is a known fact to all the foreign residents in Peiping, especially English and Americans. Japan did try to create disorder in North China, to use it as an alibi or excuse to concentrate more troops in that area. It happened in Chang-peh Hsien, where Japan hired rascals and so-called ronins to make trouble, but it was well taken care of by the local government, and order was restored.

Q General, sir, you are not answering my question. I am not interested in a speech. What I asked

you was: is it not a fact that the Japanese lost more nationals as a result of barbarity and banditry and undisciplined soldiers, and more property than any other nation in China under the Protocol Agreement?

That can be answered very simply, yes or no.

A What I say meant no.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren, would you help us by stating just what you are trying to establish in referring to Chinese losses. I did not have the impression when you were reading from the Lytton report that your purpose is to show that what the Japanese did was justified under treaties about which no question arises — those following the Boxer Rebellion. Where are we now?

MR. WARREN: I am speaking about Japanese losses, sir. Great stress has been laid on this report that I have.

THE PRESIDENT: Aggressors, or we will say invaders, can lose heavily.

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, I am not speaking about that.

THE PRESIDENT: Can they enforce agreements?

It is quite irrelevant to show that if Japan was an aggressor, was an invader, we will say, that she was able to compel these people to make treaties with her,

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and that she lost heavily. Those things are quite beside the question that arises here.

MR. WARREN: If your Honor please, I think you entirely misapprehend my questioning. The United States, Great Britain, and other powers had in China at the same time -- after the Boxer Rebellion we had our nationals there, our business interests that we were protecting, and so was Japan. So if great stress is laid on the fact, if it please your Honor, by the prosecution in their exhibits, that Japan had more soldiers than any other nation, by the same token I feel that I have a right to show, on cross-examination, in the face of this witness's explanation, which your Honor has required me to let him make, that Japan likewise had more nationals and owned more property interests than the other nations, and it took a greater police power to protect them than any other nation. all I am trying to show; that is all I am asking this witness. He knows it; he knows it very well.

THE PRESIDENT: So long as you can rest your cross-examination on treaties not in question here -- those made following the Boxer Rebellion -- well, you are within your rights.

Colonel Morrow.

COLONEL MORROW: If the Court please, I believe

the witness ought to be allowed to have translated to him in Chinese these remarks of counsel that he may follow the trend. THE PRESIDENT: No, I do not agree with you. This is a convenient break. We will recess now for fifteen minutes. (Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Goldberg & Barton

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. KIYOSE.

DR. KIYOSE: Mr. President, after having been listening to the testimony made by the witness, I have noticed that there is a little difference in the translations. Among the defense counsel, there are a few of us who understand a little Chinese. And from this knowledge we can see that, here again, there is a slight difference in the translations. In the case of a letter being translated into Japanese, we have always had monitors to supervise the accuracy of the interpretation. However, unfortunately, in the case of the Chinese, we have not been favored with such a provision. Perhaps that is the reason why we are not entirely satisfied.

LANGUAGE SECTION CHIEF: Mr. President, we have a new setup here adding one more interpreter taking the question from the prosecution and taking the witness' answer, translating witness' answer into English. We have two interpreters here to improve the interpretation to be carried out and they will monitor each other.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, as I explained before, all this interpretation of every word is not required in the interests of justice. It is required in the interests of propaganda. That is the whole point.

This elaborate system of interpreting every word does not obtain in any national court. We try murderers there. We try men who cannot speak the English language, but we do not have all of this interpreting. I would like the Japanese to understand that. The Charter really is mostly concerned with the Japanese people understanding what is happening in this Court. It is not required in the interests of justice. However, we will do our best. We will try to carry out the Charter but at present it seems Dr. KIYOSE, that your objection is not well supported.

DR. KIYOSE: Mr. President, I respect your esteemed opinion. Unless there is a very great difference in the whole meaning, we do not wish to raise any objections. But, inasmuch as the present witness is a very important one, and his testimony will consequently have a very important bearing on the outcome of the trials, we are raising this point. If, however, we are reluctant and we shall not raise any points which we can consider to be minor in importance.

THE MONITOR: The one point to be added on this is that "We regret to have judges, Mr. President and the other judges, receive wrong impressions because of the translation. That is why we are raising

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

20

21

23

24

this problem. However, we will not quibble over words or usage of words. We would like the substantial meaning of the translation to be accurate. That is all."

MR. PRESIDENT: We appreciate your attitude, Dr. KIYOSE. We will do our best with the talent we have.

DR. KIYOSE: As it has occurred just now, even in the case of the Japanese interpretation we had to have it repeated before the real significance could be brought out. In the case of the Chinese it would be, -- this difference would become more marked.

THE MONITOR: "The danger of this procedure is that we do not have Chinese monitors. Therefore, if we do have monitors, I think it can be corrected.

THE PRESIDENT: I have never known monitors in any court but this.

Yes, Col. Warren.

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, the only question that I have had raised with reference to the interpretation is that the new interpreter, I am sure he has no ulterior motives in mind at all, but on several occasions he has conferred with the witness either in further explanation of the question or some

other matter and some of the American counsel have objected. I would ask the Tribunal to caution him on that point. I realize he is doing the best he can for us but that might become an important factor in changing the meaning of an answer.

THE PRESIDENT: Now I have tried scores of cases with interpreters and my experience was and is that interpreters and witnesses frequently, if not invariably, question one another to a great extent, at great length.

And I would like that to go on record that I have noticed here today nothing unusual in the conduct of the interpreter and the witness.

MR. WARREN: I was expressing, your Honor, what had been conveyed to me and I will proceed with the cross-examination.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. WARREN:

Q General, sir, at the beginning of July, 1937, is it not true that in addition to Japan that the United States, Great Britain and France also had troops stationed in Northern China?

A Yes.

Q Is it not also true that they had trouble with Japanese -- I mean Chinese banditry as well as

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the J	ap	an	e	S	e	?
-------	----	----	---	---	---	---

A No.

Q I can very well see where that question may have been confusing in the manner I put it. I will place it this way.

Is it not true that the French, English and Americans who were stationed in Northern Japan at that time had trouble with bandits? I mean North China.

- A I have never heard of that.
- Q Were you in the vicinity at that time?
- A I was in Peiping.
- Q And you never heard of trouble between the French, the Americans and the English with Japanese -- I mean Chinese bandits as a result of brigandage there?

A I have never heard of that; neither had I received any reports from any of these foreign consulates or embassies, Great Britain or American or French authorities.

Q Now with reference to the statement in the second part of paragraph A-1 of the Prologue of your Factual Account of July 7th Incident, you state in substance that all the policies of the local authorities in several different places were

formulated and carried out in conformity with instructions and laws proclaimed by the National Government and that they were interfered with by the Japanese and then you state: "For example, the election of representatives of the People's Congress, the concentrated military training of all college students, were considered by the Japanese aggressors as measures inconsistent with the status of special area."

In what manner were the Japanese aggressors at that time?

A Regarding the election of representatives to the People's Congress, Japanese by the name of TAKAHASHI from the Japanese Embassy had approached Mr. Hsiao-Chengying and myself to stop this election. At that time he induced us by saying that if we refrained from putting on the election and if we disobeyed the orders issued by the Central Government, the Japanese Government will be able to help the Hopei China Political Council politically and economically.

Q General, I am speaking -- General, sir,
perhaps I misinterpret your use of the word "aggressors".

Do you mean to convey that up until that time they
were actively participating in an aggressive war

against you or were they aggressive in some other manner?

A Yes.

Q Is it not true that the Japanese objected to propaganda being taught in the schools against Japanese and other foreign persons and that they did object strenuously to the training, intensive and concentrated training, I mean, of students in the military arts along with the propaganda that was being given to them?

A The Japanese, on the pretext that this concentrated military training in the universities and colleges instils anti-Japanese ideas, demanded that these be abolished.

Addition, please. However, the military training we had given to our students was purely for self-defense reasons.

Morse & Abram

S

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, I would like to request the Tribunal to respectfully request this witness to answer my questions without giving his conclusions that on a pretext of this kind or a pretext of the other, he can answer these questions without. I don't care for his conclusions, and your Honor, once an answer is in, does not permit us to strike it. I feel we should be at least afforded the protection of an admonishment to the witness not to state conclusions not based on facts, which he has given to the Tribunal. I feel that the Tribunal can well pass upon the question of whether it was a pretext or not. If he will just state the facts to the Tribunal, that is all I want him to do..

ination in chief consists of conclusions, if I recollect rightly. It is not the kind of evidence we would allow in chief if he gave his evidence from the box. But I will ask him to confine himself to simple answers to the questions, to make sure if he can that his answers do not extend beyond the questions.

THE WITNESS: I have never overstepped the bounds of the answer.

MR. WARREN: Thank you, General.

2

3

THE PRESIDENT: He may always explain an answer if he thinks fit. Did the Japanese, or did they not, inform you that they felt that the intensive military training. together with the propaganda being disseminated to the students against the Japanese and other nationals foreign to China were inconsistent with the treaty commitments with China with reference to their status in the special areas? THE PRESIDENT: We'l, you assume the fact or beg the question, whatever way you like to put it, in that interrogation. MR. WARREN: Well, your Honor, I thought maybe I could get a direct answer. I am sorry. THE PRESIDENT: Well, let him try to answer. INTERPRETER: The witness said that he didn't quite get the question. I will reframe it. In your statement quoting you state repeatedly Japanese opened negotiations and interfered with such administration but all the inducements and threats failed. Is it not a fact that you were approached many, many times by the Japanese representatives to negotiate on matters that they

considered objectionable to their special status under

their treaty obligations and rights?

A According to the Ho-UMEZU Agreement, the
Chinese troops part of the Chinese troops were
withdrawn and some of the political workers attached
in the army were also withdrawn. Other than that ther
is nothing that should be considered objectionable
by the Japanese. Also the office of the political
party were withdrawn by the agreement between General
Ho and UMEZU.
MR. WARREN: It is obvious that there was
a wrong interpretation of my question given to the
witness.
(Whomoupen the last question was

(Whereupon, the last question was read by the official court reporter.)

INTERPRETER: The question will have to be re-translated.

The witness said that the Japanese fundamentally had never acquired any special rights or status. They were forcefully trying to get the autonomy of North China which General Sung Cheyuan refused.

Q Is it not true that the Chinese refused to negotiate or to cooperate with the Japanese on a single proposition that they came to the Chinese with prior to the Incident of July 7 or the Marco Polo Bridge Incident?

A The Chinese government has never refused to negotiate with the Japanese only on the main issue, that is, disintegration of North China from China proper. This issue we refused to talk.

THE PRESIDENT: I suggest, Colonel Warren, with respect that your questions are longer than they need be and are creating much of the difficulty.

MR. WARREN: You are probably right sir.

I also feel that this witness is adopting a somewhat stubborn attitude in his answers also, but I will try to do better with the questions.

Q With reference to paragraph 3 of your prologue, you state that "the 29th Army was the main force, which had its garrisons all over Hopei, Chahar, Peiping and Tientsin. At the time of the Incident, the 37th Division under the command of General Feng Chi-An was stationed in the suburbs of Peiping."

What was the exact date that -- Just a moment.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know how the interpreters are going to pick up that.

MR. WARREN: They are not going to put up that, sir. I am trying to ask a question for some-body else, your Honor, and I have it messed up myself. He says he will ask his own question.

Q Now, General, sir, you go into great length

5

24

with reference to the Marco Polo Bridge Incident, stating the Japanese so-called aggression, and you also state that you ended with an agreement. What was the date of that agreement to cease hostilities? A As far as I remember it was on the 10th of 6 July. Now later you state that hostilities were 7 Q again resumed on the 14th of July but you do not go 8 into detail. Why did you not go into detail with reference to the commencement of hostilities on the 10 14th, or the re-commencement? 11 If I have gone into details of the re-com-12 mencement of hostilities you may think it will be 13 rather uninteresting to you again. The truth is, isn't it, General, sir, that 15 hostilities were re-commenced by the Chinese and not the Japanese, that is, that the Chinese fired the first 17 18 shots on July 14? It was the Japanese who fired the first shot. 19 You deny, then, that the resumption of 20 hostilities was commenced by the Chinese and not the 21 22 Japanese? 23 Yes. A

General, sir, is it not a fact that the

Central Chinese Government had very little control

over the outlying provinces and garrisons and especially the one that had the trouble with the Japanese on July 7? A All these places were listening to the orders of the central government. I understand, General, sir, they were 6 listening, but were they following them? 7 8 Is there any difference between listening to and following? Can you give me a definition of what 9 10 is listening to and what is following listening to? MR. WARREN: Will the interpreters please 11 do their job down there? INTERPRETER: We are doing our job. 13 14 I will explain. General, sir, as your 15 answer came to me it came to me that you were merely 16 listening to orders and that does not mean necessarily 17 that an order will be obeyed. What I want to know is 18 were the orders issued by the central government being 19 promptly obeyed by the officers in command of the 20 various battalions or whatever regiments or troops 21 you had out there? 22 A Probably the question you ask is due to the 23 fact you don't understand the system of the military 24 command.

MONITOR: Channel of command.

THE RESIDENT: We will adjourn now until half past nine tomorrow morning. (Whereupon, at 1600, an adjourn-ment was taken until Wednesday, 24 July 1946, at 0930.)